COPY

BEFORE THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

In The Matter of Charges and

Complaint Against

DIPAK KANTILAL DESAI, M.D.,

Respondent.

| NCase No. 08-6001-1
| FILED 25 April 208

COMPLAINT

The Investigative Committee of the Board of Medical Examiners of the state of Nevada, composed of Charles N. Held, M.D., Chairman, Cindy Lamerson, M.D. Member, and Jean Stoess, M.A., Member, by and through Lyn E. Beggs, Deputy General Counsel for the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners, having a reasonable basis to believe that Dipak Kantilal Desai, M.D., hereinafter referred to as "Respondent," has violated the provisions of NRS Chapter 630, hereby issues its formal Complaint, stating the Investigative Committee's charges and allegations, as follows:

- 1. Respondent is currently licensed in active status, and was so licensed by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners, hereinafter referred to as "the Board," pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 630 of the Nevada Revised Statutes, at the time of the incidents in question.
- 2. Respondent is the principle owner of the Endoscopy Center of Southern Nevada, LLC, hereinafter referred to as "ECSN," located at 700 Shadow Lane in Las Vegas, Nevada, and was the principle owner at the time of the incidents in question.
- 3. Patient A was a sixty-seven-year-old male at the time of the matter in question. His true identity is not disclosed to protect his privacy, but his identity is disclosed in the Patient Designation served on Respondent along with a copy of this Complaint.
- 4. On July 25, 2007, Patient A underwent a colonoscopy at ECSN, which was performed by Respondent.

28 | ///

///

///

- 5. Subsequent to the procedure, Patient A tested positive for hepatitis C, although prior to the colonoscopy patient A was not known to have hepatitis C.
- 6. Due to unsafe practices and policies at ECSN, Patient A contracted hepatitis C while at ECSN for his colonoscopy.
- 7. Respondent knew, or should have known, of the unsafe practices and policies at ECSN, both as a physician at, and principle owner of, ECSN, which placed Patient A's health and safety at risk.
- 8. Patient B was a thirty-seven-year-old female at the time of the matter in question. Her true identity is not disclosed to protect her privacy, but her identity is disclosed in the Patient Designation served on Respondent along with a copy of this Complaint.
- 9. On September 21, 2007, Patient B underwent a colonoscopy at ECSN, which was performed by Respondent.
- 10. Subsequent to the procedure, Patient B tested positive for hepatitis C, although prior to the colonoscopy Patient B was not known to have hepatitis C.
- 11. Due to unsafe practices and policies at ECSN, Patient B contracted hepatitis C while at ECSN for her colonoscopy.
- 12. Respondent knew, or should have known, of the unsafe practices and policies at ECSN, both as a physician at, and principle owner of, ECSN, which placed Patient B's health and safety at risk.
- 13. Patient C was a seventy-two-year-old male at the time of the matter in question. His true identity is not disclosed to protect his privacy, but his identity is disclosed in the Patient Designation served on Respondent along with a copy of this Complaint.
- 14. On September 21, 2007, Patient C underwent a colonoscopy at ECSN, which was performed by Respondent.
- 15. Subsequent to the procedure, Patient C tested positive for hepatitis C, although prior to the colonoscopy Patient C was not known to have hepatitis C.
- 16. Due to unsafe practices and policies at ECSN, Patient C contracted hepatitis C while at ECSN for his colonoscopy.

17. Respondent knew, or should have known, of the unsafe practices and policies at ECSN, both as a physician at, and principle owner of, the ECSN, which placed Patient C's health and safety at risk.

Count I

- 18. Nevada Administrative Code Section 630.040 defines malpractice as the failure of a physician, in treating a patient, to use the reasonable care, skill, or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances.
- 19. Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(4) provides that malpractice is grounds for initiating disciplinary action against a physician.
- 20. Respondent failed to use the reasonable care, skill, or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances when he performed a colonoscopy on Patient A, knowing, or being in a position to have known, that the unsafe practices and policies at ECSN could put Patient A's health and safety at risk, constituting a violation of Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(4).
- 21. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in Section 630.352 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

Count II

- 22. Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(7) provides that engaging in conduct that violates the trust of a patient and exploits the relationship between the physician and patient for financial gain is grounds for initiating disciplinary action.
- 23. Respondent violated the trust of Patient A and exploited the physician-patient relationship for financial gain when he performed a colonoscopy on Patient A at a facility in which he had a financial interest, knowing, or being in a position that he should have known, of the unsafe practices at the facility that could put the health and safety of Patient A at risk, constituting a violation of Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(7).
- 24. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in Section 630.352 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

27 | 1///

28 | ///

Count III

- 25. Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(9) provides that engaging in conduct that brings the medical profession into disrepute is grounds of initiating discipline.
- 26. Respondent brought the medical profession into disrepute when he engaged in conduct as outlined above which placed Patient A's health and safety at risk, thus violating Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(9).
- 27. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in Section 630.352 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

Count IV

- 28. Nevada Administrative Code Section 630.040 defines malpractice as the failure of a physician, in treating a patient, to use the reasonable care, skill, or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances.
- 29. Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(4) provides that malpractice is grounds for initiating disciplinary action against a physician.
- 30. Respondent failed to use the reasonable care, skill, or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances when he performed a colonoscopy on Patient B, knowing, or being in a position to have known, that the unsafe practices and policies at ECSN could put Patient B's health and safety at risk, constituting a violation of Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(4).
- 31. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in Section 630.352 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

Count V

- 32. Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(7) provides that engaging in conduct that violates the trust of a patient and exploits the relationship between the physician and patient for financial gain is grounds for initiating disciplinary action.
- 33. Respondent violated the trust of Patient B and exploited the physician-patient relationship for financial gain when he performed a colonoscopy on Patient B at a facility in which he had a financial interest, knowing, or being in a position that he should have known, of the unsafe

practices at the facility that could put the health and safety of Patient B at risk, constituting a violation of Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(7).

34. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in Section 630.352 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

Count VI

- 35. Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(9) provides that engaging in conduct that brings the medical profession into disrepute is grounds of initiating discipline.
- 36. Respondent brought the medical profession into disrepute when he engaged in conduct as outlined above which placed Patient B's health and safety at risk, thus violating Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(9).
- 37. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in Section 630.352 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

Count VII

- 38. Nevada Administrative Code Section 630.040 defines malpractice as the failure of a physician, in treating a patient, to use the reasonable care, skill, or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances.
- 39. Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(4) provides that malpractice is grounds for initiating disciplinary action against a physician.
- 40. Respondent failed to use the reasonable care, skill, or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances when he performed a colonoscopy on Patient C, knowing, or being in a position to have known, that the unsafe practices and policies at ECSN could put Patient C's health and safety at risk, constituting a violation of Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(4).
- 41. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in Section 630.352 of the Nevada Revised Statutes

Count VIII

42. Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(7) provides that engaging in conduct that violates the trust of a patient and exploits the relationship between the physician and patient for financial gain is grounds for initiating disciplinary action.

- 43. Respondent violated the trust of Patient C and exploited the physician-patient relationship for financial gain when he performed a colonoscopy on Patient C at a facility in which he had a financial interest, knowing, or being in a position that he should have known, of the unsafe practices at the facility that could put the health and safety of Patient C at risk, constituting a violation of Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(7).
- 44. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in Section 630.352 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

Count IX

- 45. Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(9) provides that engaging in conduct that brings the medical profession into disrepute is grounds of initiating discipline.
- 46. Respondent brought the medical profession into disrepute when he engaged in conduct as outlined above which placed Patient C's health and safety at risk, thus violating Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.301(9).
- 47. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in Section 630.352 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

Count X

- 48. Nevada Revised Statutes Section 630.306(7) provides that the continual failure to exercise the skill or diligence or use the methods ordinarily exercised under the same circumstances by physicians in good standing practicing in the same specialty or field is grounds for initiating discipline.
- 49. Respondent failed to exercise the skill or diligence or use the methods ordinarily exercised under the same circumstances by physicians in good standing practicing in the same specialty or field when he, by his conduct outlined above, put the health and safety of Patients A, B and C at risk, as evidenced by all three patients contracting hepatitis C.
- 50. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in Section 630.352 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

WHEREFORE, the Investigative Committee prays:

1. That the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners fix a time and place for a formal hearing;

ł	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
	11

- 2. That the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners give Respondent notice of the charges herein against him, the time and place set for the hearing, and the possible sanctions against him;
- 3. That the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners determine what sanctions it determines to impose for the violation or violations committed by Respondent;
- 4. That the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners make, issue and serve on Respondent its findings of facts, conclusions of law and order, in writing, that includes the sanctions imposed; and
- 5. That the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners take such other and further action as may be just and proper in these premises.

DATED this day of April, 2008.

INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

Lyn E. Beggs

Attorney for the Investigative Committee of the Nevada

State Board of Medical Examiners

VERIFICATION

STATE OF NEVADA) : ss. COUNTY OF DOUGLAS)

CHARLES N. HELD, M.D., having been duly sworn, hereby deposes and states under penalty of perjury that he is the Chairman of the Investigative Committee of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners that authorized the complaint against the Respondent herein; that he has read the foregoing Complaint; and that based upon information discovered in the course of the investigation into a complaint against Respondent, he believes that the allegations and charges in the foregoing Complaint against Respondent are true, accurate, and correct.

DATED this 25th day of pril , 2008.

CHARLES N. HELD, M.D.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that I am employed by Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners and that on the 25th day of April 2008, I served a file copy of the COMPLAINT, PATIENT DESIGNATION, NOTICE OF PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE & HEARING, along with copy of appointment letter, by mailing via FED-EX Priority Overnight to the following:

Dipak Desai, M.D. 3093 Red Arrow Dr. Las Vegas, NV 89135

Dated this 25th day of April 2008.

Angelia Donohoe Legal Assistant